

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 18, 2006 from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner objected to the drawings, namely Figures 4 and 5 and the failure to label the separate sheets of Figures 13 and 28 as Fig. 13A, Fig 13B, etc. The Examiner objected to the abstract as being too long and objected to the use of "GTech" in the disclosure as being a trademarked term. The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and objected to claims 2-9 and 23-26 for containing incorrect grammar and an improper Markush group. Applicants have amended the Abstract and the claims, submit herewith replacement drawings, and provide the following:

Claims 1-2, 4-9, and 23-25 are amended.

Objections to the Drawings:

Applicants have submitted herewith replacement drawings that overcome the objections made by the Examiner. Applicants hereby respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Objections to the Specification:

In the Office Action, the Examiner Objected to the Abstract as exceeding 150 words in length. Applicants have amended the abstract to comply with the 150-word limitation, and here provide a clean copy of the amended abstract for the convenience of the Examiner:

A computerized meridian linking diagnostic and treatment system is disclosed. The system outputs two permanent filters (frequencies) that link all of the body's meridians and stabilize data access points used for testing and other functions, resulting in an interconnected meridian network linking the internal body systems

to data access points. Energetic readings are taken at the data access points, and the most stable points are stored. Customized filters (frequencies) relating to specific issues or maladies are output or broadcast, and a single stable data access point is observed for imbalanced readings signaling a disturbance created by any of the filters. The system then automatically loads and scans through a database of products (remedies) that are useful for restoring homeostasis or balance until one or more products is discovered that will remove the underlying disturbance. The product/remedy is then placed in a holding tank that stores the results of each test.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to the use of the word GTech on page 24, Applicants note that this is the only instance of the use of GTech, and that the usage is not in a trademark sense, but rather is used as part of a company name identifier. Therefore, GTech does not refer to any particular device for which generic terminology exists. Therefore, the requirement of the Examiner is improper, as "GTech L.L.C." is the identifier of a limited liability company and is not being used as a trademarked term referring to a device. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph/Claim Objections:


Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above and believe they have corrected every problem leading to indefiniteness and grammar problem identified by the Examiner. Applicants therefore respectfully request removal of the rejections and withdrawal of the objections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 18 day of December, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Krieger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,232

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 328-3600

ADS/krw
Doc#931076